



# METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY

## METRO HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION SUMMARY MEETING MINUTES

Metropolitan Historic Zoning Commission  
Sunnyside in Sevier Park  
3000 Granny White Pike  
Nashville, Tennessee 37204  
Telephone: (615) 862-7970  
Fax: (615) 862-7974

November 20, 2013

**Commissioners Present:** Chairman Brian Tibbs, Vice-chair Ann Nielson, Menié Bell, Sam Champion, Aaron Kaalberg  
**Zoning Staff:** Sean Alexander, Melissa Baldock, Paul Hoffman, Robin Zeigler (Historic Zoning Administrator), Susan T. Jones (City Attorney)  
**Applicants:** Manuel Zeitlin, Van Pond, Larry Prater, Brent Craig, William Smallman, Matt Schutz, John Donelson, Anita Howard, Bob Potter  
**Public:** Lindsey Trella-Moffatt,

Chairperson Tibbs called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m. and read aloud the process for appealing the decisions of the Metro Historic Zoning Commission and the time limits on presentations.

### MINUTES:

#### Motion:

Vice-chair Nielson moved to approve the October 16, 2013 minutes without changes. Commissioner Kaalberg seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

### I. CONSENT AGENDA

Chairperson Tibbs read aloud the process for the Consent Agenda.

#### a. 2501 BARTON AVE

Application: New construction-addition  
Council District: 18  
Overlay: Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER  
Permit ID #: 1948470

#### b. 2000 19TH AVE S

Application: Demolition--outbuilding and existing addition; New construction--addition and outbuilding  
Council District: 18  
Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK  
Permit ID #: 1948098

#### c. 927 FATHERLAND ST

Application: New construction--outbuilding  
Council District: 06  
Overlay: Edgefield Historic Zoning Overlay  
Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

Permit ID #: 1948109

**d. 2401 FAIRFAX**

Application: New construction-outbuilding

Council District: 18

Overlay: Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: PAUL HOFFMAN

Permit ID #: 1948780

**e. 1416 GARTLAND AVE**

Application: Conversion to Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit

Council District: 06

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

Permit ID #: 1948074

**f. 1107 SHELBY AVE**

Application: New construction--addition

Council District: 06

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

Permit ID #: 1948086

**g. 110 S 17TH ST**

Application: New construction-addition

Council District: 06

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: PAUL HOFFMAN

Permit ID #: 1945184

**h. 1513 PARIS AVE**

Application: New construction-DADU

Council District: 18

Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: PAUL HOFFMAN

Permit ID #: 1948573

There were no requests to speak and no requests to remove any items from the consent agenda.

**Motion:**

**Vice-chair Nielson moved to approve the consent agenda items with all applicable recommended conditions.**

**Commissioner Bell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

#### **IV. NEW BUSINESS**

Councilmember Allen spoke against the infill project at 1818 Wildwood. She stated that she had tremendous respect for the architect but that there was no precedent for back-to-back duplexes and suggested that the plan be altered to include a primary building with a detached accessory dwelling unit, be a single-family home, or be a side-by-side duplex.

Councilmember Allen also spoke against the infill project at 1910 Linden, stating concerns about the use of materials and that she was in agreement with all of staff's recommendation.

**i. 204 SOUTH 11TH ST**

Application: Demolition

Council District: 06

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER

Permit ID #: 1948576

This project was removed at the applicant's request. No discussion took place and there was no action.

**j. 1818 WILDWOOD AVE**

Application: New construction-infill, Setback determination

Council District: 06

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER

Permit ID #: 1948709

Staff member, Robin Zeigler presented the case for a duplex infill project in Belmont-Hillsboro. She described the immediate context as an intact collection of post-war Minimal Traditional homes found on the 1800 and 1900 blocks of Wildwood. Typical features of these Minimal Traditional homes are one-story rectangular forms with side gable roofs. None have porches.

She stated that staff found the proposed building to be inappropriate for the neighborhood in terms of scale, form and orientation because there are no historic examples of duplexes being back-to-back, only fully side-by-side. The location and the front and side setbacks are appropriate; however, the great depth of the building requires a reduction of the 20' setback in one portion. The proposed 27' foot tall 2-story building is out of scale with the context that is mainly 20-23' tall, 1-story homes. Few of the materials are known; however, those that were indicated- roofing and foundation- are appropriate. Taking into account the historic context, the roof pitch is too steep. The majority of the post-war homes have a lower pitch than the proposed 9/12. The orientation of the front unit is appropriate; however, the orientation of the second unit is not as it faces the side of the lot, rather than the street. The location of the HVAC and other utilities were not noted.

Ms. Zeigler first explained that in the past, the Commission has required that attached garages not only be at the basement level but also be in the appropriate location for an accessory structure. Side-loading basement garages have only been allowed where there is no option for a rear-loading garage. In this case, the project has two side-loading, two-bay, basement garages, which are in inappropriate locations.

Staff recommended disapproval finding that the project does not meet the historic context of this portion of the Belmont-Hillsboro neighborhood, specifically sections II.B.1.a, b, c, e, f and i of the design guidelines. Additional information is required to assess sections II.B.1.d and h. If the Commission disagrees, staff recommends that the applicant be asked to defer the project so that the additional information needed may be reviewed by Staff.

Manuel Zeitlin, architect for the project, handed out some plans and contextual photographs. He explained that the goal of the design was to fit the massing into the historic context and the reason that the house is so long is so that the front of the house would be appropriate. He stated that historic preservation isn't about matching use but instead form, and that he finds it disturbing that staff recommended not taking the historic house across the street into consideration when looking at the context.

He clarified that the height of the proposed is only 4' taller than the context, they had not intended on needing a rear setback determination, and that they could make that change to accommodate bulk standards. They inset the rear of the house by 2', the same as if the front part was an existing building and the rear section was an addition. The point of the garages was to accommodate the cars that will be needed on the site. He clarified the pitches of the homes in the neighborhood and the fact that almost all had occupied second stories. A porch was added to the design, according to Mr. Zeitlin, because the design guidelines call for porches.

The commission and the applicant discussed the context. Mr. Zeitlin stated that the block was only 15% intact in terms of historic context.

Linda Steer, 1819 Wildwood Avenue, stated that she does not approve a side-by-side duplex for this lot and believes this project is a success because the cars are kept off the street.

Lindsey Trella-Moffat, representing the neighborhood association, stated that she appreciates what the architect has accomplished but that the orientation of the duplex does not have a precedent in the neighborhood. Deep lots are prevalent in the neighborhood and if this becomes a precedent any lot could have a house behind it that would change the character of the neighborhood.

Sandra Shelton, 1830 Wildwood Avenue, stated that her comments also represent the views of William Welborn at 1826 Wildwood Avenue, Rich Veluzat at 1907 Wildwood, and Jane High at 1916 Wildwood. She bought her home there 30 years ago because she liked the smaller scale homes with a large yard that this minimal traditional development provided. She believes the proposed house to be out-of-scale for the context. She conceded that the historic home across the street is larger than the rest of the context; however, it is on a much larger lot.

William Northrup, 1914 Wildwood, supported all the other comments in opposition of the project. There are already a lot of exceptions that do not fit into the neighborhood and the project does not fit in with the integrity of the neighborhood.

Commissioner Kaalberg said they were looking at design and not use and most of what they heard was based on the use being a duplex. He wanted to be sure that everyone understood that use is a zoning issue that they do not have the ability to change. Commissioner Champion stated that he agreed with Commissioner Kaalberg and what they are judging is how it addresses the street.

Ms. Zeigler explained that when the overlay was adopted, it was the intent of the neighborhood to preserve the minimal traditional homes.

Commissioner Kaalberg questioned what the context was that they were comparing the new construction with. For instance, in terms of Height & Scale, staff states that it is out of scale for the historic context, yet Mr. Zeitlin pointed out that there is a historic 2-story house across the street. With Mr. Zeitlin's alteration to the rear of the building all the setbacks appear to be appropriate.

Commissioner Kaalberg continued to say that the only guidance the guidelines provide in terms of orientation is that new buildings shall be visually consistent with surrounding buildings. He claimed that nothing stops them from creating interpretations of orientation now, given that they are looking at something fairly new.

Commissioner Champion stated that the problem is that, given the context, the building is too big, even if it addresses the street appropriately and even if it is a back-to-back duplex.

Commissioner Kaalberg expressed concern about the orientation of the building and the two attached garages, in terms of the design guidelines and past decisions.

Mr. Zeitlin requested feedback from the commission as to whether or not the historic 2-story house was considered part of the context or not and to hand out additional information. Commissioner Kaalberg stated that they were not prepared to provide feedback on the context as there were only 5 commissioners present and that required a good bit more debate. The Commission's legal counsel, Susan T. Jones reminded the Commission of the adoption of their rules of order and procedure for accepting new information. Mr. Zeitlin chose to defer the case.

#### **k. 1705 WOODLAND ST**

Application: New construction-infill and outbuilding, Setback determination

Council District: 06

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER  
Permit ID #: 1948473

Staff member, Sean Alexander presented the case of a new building at 1705 Woodland Street. The applicant is proposing to demolish a non-contributing structure and construct a new two-family dwelling with a detached garage. The new structure will be two-stories tall, thirty-two feet from peak top grade at the front and forty feet wide. The width is consistent from the front edge to the rear and from the foundation to the eave.

The surrounding context is mostly one and one and a half story houses, but some of them have steeply pitched hipped roofs so they are actually pretty tall, and there are some two story houses very nearby, so staff finds that the proposed height is compatible. The widths of historic houses vary between 28' and 35' feet with uniform lot widths of 50'. There is a well-established rhythm of solid and open space on the street, and staff finds that the massing of the proposed structure would disrupt that rhythm. The historic houses on the street also have forms that break up their massing such as bungalows and Queen Anne's, the same being true for both one and two story buildings. Reducing the width of the proposed structure and breaking up the massing of the upperstory could make the proposed project more compatible with the historic context.

The roof form, exterior materials, and the proportion and rhythm of windows, would be compatible with the surrounding historic context. Staff would ask to review the window and doors and the roofing prior to selection. There will also be a one story outbuilding at the rear of the lot. The structure will be divided inside to serve each unit of the duplex with a two car garage. The materials and roof form will be compatible with those of the house and the surrounding context.

The garage will be located 10' from the rear of the property, and stretching across the lot 3' to each side. The proposed location is appropriate. The site plan also shows the location of HVAC mechanicals being on the sides but toward the front of the building and staff recommends that they be located behind the midpoints of the side elevations.

In conclusion, Staff recommended approval of the application with the conditions that:

- The width of the building and the massing of the upperstory be reduced;
- Staff approve the color of the roof and the materials of the windows and doors;
- The HVAC units and utilities be located behind the midpoint of the structure,

Meeting those conditions, staff finds that the proposal meets the design guidelines for the Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.

Commissioner Bell asked if there was a design guideline for maximum square footage for accessory buildings. Mr. Alexander stated that there is a different need in this case since it is a duplex but the one-story height of the buildings helps the structures to remain subordinate to the primary building.

Mr. Van Pond, architect for the project, stated that he wasn't able to respond to all the recommendation of staff in time to meet the deadline. He has discussed the project with his client and they understand the concern about a two-story, unbroken mass and the scale and context of the rest of the street. They are willing to break up the façade and he handed out an example of a potential way to break-up the mass. He asked to retain the full width proposed.

Mr. Matt Schutz, 605 S 10<sup>th</sup> Street, offered his support to the project explaining that the Commission approved a building at the end of Holly Street that is wide, is a similar lot size, and has less articulation. He feels that the current proposal is a better solution than the one that has been approved in the past.

Commissioner Kaalberg asked if it were appropriate if it were a single-family home. There is nothing that says they should be more flexible because of the use.

Commissioners asked for clarification of several points.

Chairman Tibbs stated that the garage seemed large but he wasn't sure he had concerns about it meeting the design guidelines.

Commissioner Champion stated it was one of the biggest ones he has ever seen and this was too massive. He explained that there are other alternatives and expressed his concerns about setting a precedent for approving large accessory buildings.

Chairman Tibbs invited the applicant back, at Mr. Pond's request. Mr. Pond clarified the actual square footage of the project which was different than what was shown on the plans.

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Champion moved to approve with the conditions that the width of the building and the massing of the upper story be reduced; Staff approve the color of the roof and the materials of the windows and doors; the HVAC units and utilities be located behind the midpoint of the structure; and the applicant continue to work with staff on reducing the scale of the rear garage. Commissioner Nielson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

In order to provide direction to the applicant, Commissioner Champion suggested that the garage be no more than a two-bay garage and that the house be no more than 35' wide. Chairman Tibbs suggested that they not try and set numbers to these issues and instead encourage the applicant to work with staff. Several members of the Commission concurred.

**I. 1902 5TH AVE N**

Application: New construction-infill

Council District: 19

Overlay: Salemtown Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

Permit ID #: 1948102

Staff member, Melissa Baldock, presented the case for new construction at 1902 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue North, an application to construct a new duplex infill on a vacant lot. The proposed structure meets the base zoning setbacks and meets the design guidelines in terms of location and setback. The duplex will be 34' wide at the front, and will expand to be 40' wide about 13' behind the front wall of the house. The duplex will be one-and-a-half stories and will have two symmetrical entryways. Staff finds that its height of 27' at the front and 29' feet further back meets the design guidelines. However, staff asks that a condition of approval be that the wider portion of the house has a lower eave height to better match the historic context. This taller section could also be relocated so it is further back from the front of the house.

In addition, staff asks that the faux window openings behind the entryways be reconfigured to be a more typical window configuration. The known materials have all been approved by the Commission in the past, and staff asks to review a brick sample, the shingle color, all windows and doors and the materials for the front porch columns and porch floor. Staff also asks that the double windows have a 4 to 6 inch mullion in between them.

In conclusion, staff recommends approval with the following conditions:

1. The wider portion of the house have a reduced eave height or be relocated to better match the historic context;
2. Staff review a brick sample, shingle color, windows and doors, and materials for the porch columns and floor;
3. The siding have a maximum reveal of 5";
4. Double and triple windows have a 4 to 6" mullion in between them;
5. The front dormer windows be brought closer together;
6. The faux window openings on the side facades be reconfigured;
7. The HVAC units be placed at the rear or on a side façade beyond the midpoint of the house.

Chairman Tibbs asked about the rhythm of the windows and Ms. Baldock explained that staff has been less stringent about the rhythm of the windows, the further back on the house because of their limited visibility.

Mr. Larry Prater stated that the eave heights are an error. The three eave heights will be symmetrical and he is in agreement with all conditions.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

**Motion:**

**Vice-chairperson Nielson moved to approve with the conditions that the:**

- 1. The wider portion of the house have a reduced eave height or be relocated to better match the historic context;**
- 2. Staff review a brick sample, shingle color, windows and doors, and materials for the porch columns and floor;**
- 3. The siding have a maximum reveal of 5”;**
- 4. Double and triple windows have a 4 to 6” mullion in between them;**
- 5. The front dormer windows be brought closer together;**
- 6. The faux window openings on the side facades be reconfigured;**
- 7. The HVAC units be placed at the rear or on a side façade beyond the midpoint of the house.**

**Commissioner Bell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

**m. 1910 LINDEN AVE (aka 1908 Linden Ave)**

Application: New construction-infill and outbuilding

Council District: 18

Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

Permit ID #: 1948090

Staff member, Melissa Baldock, presented the case for new construction at 1908 Linden Avenue, a vacant lot that was until recently the side yard of 1910 Linden Avenue. The applicant is proposing to construct a new infill and a new garage on the property. The infill will meet all base zoning requirements for setbacks and meets the design guidelines for setbacks, location, and orientation.

The new infill will be two stories tall, which matches the historic context where there are several two-story structures. The house's height will be approximately 32' above grade, which is similar to other structures in the area. However, staff asks that the foundation height be reduced at the front so that it is a maximum of 2' at its lowest point, accounting for the cross slope of the site. The infill is designed so that there is no foundation beneath the front porch, which makes the front porch columns unusually tall and out of scale and character with the district. Staff asks that the porch have a typical foundation matching the foundation of the house and that the stone bases for the columns stop at the porch floor level. On the front façade, staff also asks that the shutters on the second story central window either be removed or be made so that they are full-size, fully operable shutters.

On the right elevation, the second story bay towards the front of the house is atypical. Staff asks that this either be reduced in width or eliminated entirely. The known materials for the house have all been approved in the Belmont-Hillsboro conservation overlay in the past. They include cement fiberboard siding with a 4" reveal, miratec trim, split face concrete block foundation, and asphalt shingles in the weather wood color. The windows will be Marvin Integrity windows, and the front door will be wood. The porch columns will be Poly-pro, and the column bases will be stone. Staff asks to approve a stone sample prior to purchase and installation. The porch floor will be cypress wood, and the rear porch will be wood.

The applicant is also proposing to construct a 21 X 24' outbuilding at the rear of the property, accessed via the alley. The garage meets the base zoning setbacks, and has an eave height of 13'3" and a ridge height of 20'3", which is subordinate to the historic structure. The materials for the garage are similar to those for the infill. Staff finds that the proposed garage meets the design guidelines.

In conclusion, staff recommends approval of the infill and garage with the following conditions:

1. The foundation height be reduced so that it is a maximum of 2' at its lowest point at the front of the house;

2. The porch have a typical foundation matching the foundation of the house, and the stone bases end at the level of the porch floor;
3. The right elevation's second story bay be reduced in width or eliminated entirely;
4. Staff review the window and doors specifications and a stone sample;
5. The shutters on the front façade's second story central window be removed or be designed so that they are fully functional shutters;
6. The HVAC and utilities be placed on the rear façade, or on a side façade beyond the midpoint of the house;
7. Staff approve all new appurtenances, including fences and walkways.

Chairman Tibbs asked about the center windows, second floor of the left elevation and Mr. Craig, owner of the project, explained the window was in a stairwell. He also noted that he was in agreement with all the conditions and willing to work with the neighbors to make changes to the materials, even though not necessary in terms of the design guidelines.

David Thompson, 2005 Linden Avenue, speaking for Belmont-Hillsboro neighbors mentioned the fact that the majority of 2-story buildings in the neighborhood are brick or stone and not lap siding. The stone on the columns needs to be brick with mortar or true stone with mortar in order to fit in with the neighborhood. They do not want a circular drive on this street, as this owner has done elsewhere in the neighborhood. They also support the condition that the foundation of the porch be filled in. He restated the design guidelines that support these requests.

Laura Swanson, who lives across the street, stated that the plans look like a stock home and don't fit in with the neighborhood. She has looked at other homes constructed by this builder and there are several that are identical to what is proposed. She also stated that she and her husband were in support of Mr. Thompson's comments. The front porch looks like decking with wood stairs and wood stairs are not common in historic neighborhoods. The historic homes in the neighborhood are brick and there is one that is half-stone and so she feels that the overlay requires that the home meet the rhythm and the context of the structures around it. She questioned that, even though hardi panel is allowed, should it be allowed where the context is primarily brick?

Lindsey Trella Moffat, speaking for the neighborhood association, requested preservation of the tree canopy.

Becky Brembell, 1914 Linden, expressed concern about the materials and the wooden porch. She would prefer a concrete porch and steps, a brick façade, and that the stone have a larger field stone appearance. She supports all staff recommendations.

There were no more requests from the public to speak. The applicant returned and explained that he was willing to make the house all brick, not add a curb cut and make the porch floor and steps concrete. He clarified that he has never clear-cut a lot unless the customer has requested it. They have never installed a circle driveway that they didn't have to remove.

#### **Motion:**

**Commissioner Kaalberg moved to approve with conditions that:**

1. The foundation height be reduced so that it is a maximum of 2' at its lowest point at the front of the house;
2. The porch have a typical foundation matching the foundation of the house, and the stone bases end at the level of the porch floor;
3. The right elevation's second story bay be reduced in width or eliminated entirely;
4. Staff review the window and doors specifications and a stone sample;
5. The shutters on the front façade's second story central window be removed or be designed so that they are fully functional shutters;
6. The HVAC and utilities be placed on the rear façade, or on a side façade beyond the midpoint of the house;
7. Staff approve all new appurtenances, including fences and walkways;
8. The project will not include any additional curb cut or circular drive;
9. The primary cladding and the front porch pedestals will be brick to be approved by staff;
10. Steps and porch will be concrete

**Commissioner Bell seconded 100% and the motion was approved unanimously.**



**n. 1512 PARIS AVE**

Application: New construction-infill and outbuilding

Council District: 18

Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER

Permit ID #: 1942065

Staff member, Sean Alexander presented the case for a new building at 1512 Paris Avenue. The applicant is proposing to construct a new two-story house on a vacant lot (a previous non-contributing house located there was recently demolished). The new house will be two-stories tall with a front-gabled roof, the ridge height will be 31' feet from grade and the eaves will be 16' high. The side walls will have projecting gables with higher eaves, the effect similar to having wall dormers which isn't generally a common feature, but there is a comparable form on a historic house across the street. The building will be 35' wide on a 60' wide lot. The scale of the proposed new building is compatible with surrounding historic houses. These houses across the street have similar heights and widths, but 1507 is not historic. The roof forms, exterior materials, window proportions and rhythms are all compatible with the historic context, with one exception which is that it is not typical for upperstory windows to be taller than first story windows as they would be in the front elevation. Staff would ask to review the window and doors and the roofing prior to selection.

A one and one-half story outbuilding is also proposed. The scale is subordinate to the house and the roof form and materials will be compatible. A covered breezeway would lead from the back of the house to the garage. Staff recommends that the breezeway be reduced in width or eliminated to avoid conflating the massing of the house and garage as one structure. A walkway from the front porch should also be added to engage the street, and the locations of HVAC mechanicals will need to be reviewed.

Staff recommends approval of the application to construct a new house and accessory building, with the conditions that:

- Staff approve the color of the roof and the materials of the windows and doors;

- The upperstory windows are generally not taller than those on the first story on the front elevation;

- A walkway be added from the front porch to the street, and that the location of HVAC units and utilities be approved by Staff; and,

- The cover over the walkway from the garage be reduced.

Meeting those conditions, staff finds that the proposal meets the design guidelines for the Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.

Commissioner Bell asked for clarification as to whether or not the walkway recommendation was to remove it or reduce it. Mr. Alexander explained that the recommendation was to reduce the width to prevent the garage from being connected to the house.

The applicant, William Smallman, stated that he agreed with all the conditions with the exception of the garage connection. Right now it is larger than what staff recommends but he is attempting to cover staircase and a potential handicap ramp.

The commission and staff discussed the cover dimensions, ADA issues and potential use. Commissioner Kaalberg noted that the ramp was not in place at the moment and stairs might be able to be converted to ramp, if that use was needed in the future and so Staff could review that at the time it was proposed.

MHZA's legal counsel, Susan Jones explained that under Title 17 the zoning administrator has the authority to grant reasonable accommodations but a change to the project at a later date would come back to the Commission at that time.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Kaalberg moved to approve the project with the conditions that Staff approve the color of the roof and the materials of the windows and doors**

- the upperstory windows not be taller than those on the first story on the front elevation
- a walkway be added from the front porch to the street
- that the location of HVAC units and utilities be approved by Staff
- the cover over the walkway from the garage be reduced.

Vice-chair Nielson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

**o. 1411 ORDWAY PL**

Application: Demolition; New construction-infill and outbuilding  
 Council District: 06  
 Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay  
 Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER  
 Permit ID #: 1948471

Staff member, Sean Alexander presented the case for a new building at 1411 Ordway Place. The applicant is proposing to demolish a non-contributing building and construct a new house and outbuilding. The new house will be two-stories tall with a Gabled-L form. The house will have a ridge-height of about 30', with eaves at 20' from grade for the front gable, with the side gable sitting 3' to 4' lower. The width of the building will be 36', but only 23' wide at the front because of the asymmetrical plan. The roof form, materials, and the proportion and rhythm of the windows are compatible with those of surrounding historic context, but staff asks to review the specifics of the roofing, windows and doors prior to selection. The outbuilding will be two-stories tall, with a footprint of about 550 sq. ft. The roof will be cross-gabled with a ridge height of 25' and eaves at 14' and staff found these proportions to be subordinate to the house and compatible with the context. The roof form and materials are appropriate.

The garage will be accessed from the front by an existing driveway, not generally a common condition, but is found at several historic houses on this block. Staff would ask to verify that the HVAC mechanicals are located on the rear or side, behind the midpoint of the house.

In conclusion, Staff recommends approval of the application with the conditions that:

- Staff approve the color of the roof and the materials of the windows and doors;
- A walkway be added from the front porch to the street, and that the location of HVAC units and utilities be approved by Staff,

Meeting those conditions, staff finds that the proposal meets the design guidelines for the Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.

Brent Craig, builder for the project, stated he was available for any questions and that the applicant was in agreement with all the conditions.

Commissioner Kaalberg asked if there was alley access. Mr. Alexander explained that there is an alley but this house doesn't have access to it and the driveway is pre-existing, similar to many of the historic homes on that side of the street.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Bell moved to approve with the conditions that Staff approve the color of the roof and the materials of the windows and doors; a walkway be added from the front porch to the street, and that the location of HVAC units and utilities be approved by Staff. Vice-chair Nielson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

**p. 918 SHELBY AVE**

Application: New construction-infill  
 Council District: 06  
 Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER  
Permit ID #: 1948787

Staff member, Robin Zeigler, presented the case for a new commercial building at 918 Shelby Street. The context for this proposed mixed-use is mainly residential. Across the street at the corner is an historic auto-related building and a non-historic gas station. The project is to construct a two-story commercial building that consists of two separate forms connected by a breezeway. Staff recommends a condition that final detailed drawings be submitted prior to the issuance of a permit.

The grade changes dramatically from the front corner to the opposite rear corner. At its highest point on Shelby Street, the building is proposed to be thirty-three and six inches (33' 6") tall from grade. The building includes a trellis roof that adds another nine feet (9') in height. The eclectic context, which includes small one-story homes as well as two and two and one-half story homes, does not support thirty-four feet (34'). In 2006, a duplex was approved at 915 Shelby Street that is approximately thirty-feet tall and in 2005 a one-story home was approved at 814 Shelby Street that is approximately twenty feet (20') tall. Staff recommends that the overall height be lowered so that the building is no more than thirty feet (30') tall from the lowest point of existing grade, to better match the context and meet the bulk zoning requirements. Although the proposed will still be taller than the majority of buildings in the immediate area, its flat roof and location at a low grade, will minimize its height.

The steel columns of the porch are in comparison to the massing of the building and appear to be out of scale. Typically porch posts, even on commercial buildings, have a post and cap. Staff recommends a thicker post that includes some type of post and cap. With this condition, the project meets section II.B.1. and 2.

The project meets the context in terms of setbacks, roof form, orientation and proportion and rhythm of openings. The corner building will be clad in stucco on the left side and the front corner with brick on the right side. The smaller building will be clad in brick on the front. Materials for the right side and rear were not indicated. Because materials typically changed horizontally, rather than vertically, staff recommends that the entire corner building be stucco or brick rather than stucco on two facades with brick on the third. In addition, staff recommends staff review façade materials for the right side and rear elevations.

The design/manufacture of windows and doors, brick, parking area and stairs are unknown. The location of the HVAC and other utilities was not noted. No signage has been proposed at this time.

Yesterday the applicant met with MDHA, who also has authority to review the project. They approved the concept and also asked for drawings with more detailing and additional information about dimension, materials, use, and parking requirements.

Staff recommends approval with the conditions that:

- More detailed drawings be submitted prior to issuance of a permit;
- The overall height (not including the rooftop pergola) be lowered to thirty-feet (30') as measured from existing grade at the front setback;
- The front porch posts be thicker to be more appropriate to the overall scale of the building and include a cap and base—which the applicant has agreed to;
- Applicant obtains staff approval of the details and materials for windows, doors, brick and pavers;
- The corner building be all stucco or all brick; and
- The HVAC be located on the rear façade, or on the roof.

With these conditions Staff finds the project to meet the design guidelines for new construction in the Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay.

John Donelson, owner of the property, explained that they were in agreement with all conditions with the exception of the height and change in materials on the corner building. Matt Shutz, designer, explained the project and passed out additional information.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Bell asked for clarification about the materials. Commissioner Kaalberg stated that there wasn't much of historic commercial context so he was inclined to allow for the change in materials.

Commissioner Champion state that the drawings were in a very conceptual state and questioned whether or not the Commission should be approving drawings at this state. Chairman Tibbs stated that they could make a decision as long as new drawings were submitted.

Vice-chairperson Tibbs invited the applicants back to answer questions. Commissioner Nielson asked how the roof would be used and Mr. Donelson stated that it would be a rooftop deck, possibly for a restaurant. She expressed concern with the noise and the use of a rooftop restaurant, not necessarily in terms of the design guidelines, but just in terms of the neighborhood. The Commission and staff discussed appropriate setbacks for rooftop decks.

Mr. Shutz responded to the discussions about materials by explaining that large commercial buildings do have a change in materials.

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Champion moved to approve the project with all staff recommendations. Commissioner Bell seconded. Commissioner Kaalberg amended the motion, with the agreement of Commissioners Bell and Kaalberg, to allow for a change in materials. The final conditions included more detailed drawings be submitted prior to issuance of a permit; the overall height (not including the rooftop pergola) be lowered to thirty-feet (30') as measured from existing grade at the front setback; the front porch posts be thicker to be more appropriate to the overall scale of the building and include a cap and base; applicant obtains staff approval of the details and materials for windows, doors, brick and pavers; and the HVAC be located on the rear façade, or on the roof. The motion passed unanimously.**

**q. 1721 5TH AVE N**

Application: New construction-infill

Council District: 19

Overlay: Salemtown Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

Permit ID #: 1948085

Staff member Melissa Baldock, presented 1721 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue North, an application for a duplex infill on a vacant lot in Salemtown. She noted that the Commission approved a design for a duplex on this site last month, but this application represents a new design by the same application.

The proposed duplex will meet all base zoning setbacks. The site plan shows that the duplex will be 20' from the front property line, but the flanking historic houses sit closer to the front property line. Staff recommends that the new infill have a similar front setback to the structure at 1719 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue North so that the line of the front porch of the duplex's left unit lines up with the front wall and porch of No. 1719. The applicant has agreed to this condition, and submitted a revised site plan this morning reflecting the change.

The new infill will have a gabled el form and will be 34 feet wide at the front, expanding to 40 feet wide about 30' behind the front wall. The duplex will have a ridge height of 25'6" at the front, and a maximum height of 30'. Staff finds that this

meets the context, where historic structures range from 16 to 32'. The known materials have all been approved by the Commission in the past and include 5" cement fiberboard siding, asphalt shingle roof, and fiber cement board and batten panels on the side projecting bays. Staff asks to review the porch column, porch floor, and foundation material. Staff also asks to review the window and door selections and the roof color.

In conclusion, staff recommends approval with the following conditions:

1. The house be pushed forward on the lot to line up with the neighbor at No. 1719 5<sup>th</sup> Ave N;
2. Staff review the porch column, porch floor and foundation materials;
3. Staff approve the window and door selections and the shingle color;
4. The HVAC unit be place at the rear or on a side facade beyond the midpoint of the house.

Ms. Anita Howards, representing the project, stated she was available for any questions.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Nielson moved to approve the project with the conditions that the house be pushed forward on the lot to line up with the neighbor at 1719 5<sup>th</sup> Ave N; Staff review the porch column, porch floor and foundation materials; Staff approve the window and door selections and the shingle color; the HVAC unit be place at the rear or on a side facade beyond the midpoint of the house. Commissioner Champion seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

**r. 915 PETWAY AVE**

Application: New construction-infill

Council District: 05

Overlay: Greenwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER

Permit ID #: 1948476

Staff member Melissa Baldock presented 915 Petway, an application for infill construction. Staff approved the demolition of the non-contributing structure on the site two weeks ago. The new structure will meet all base zoning requirements for setbacks and will be situated slightly off center on the lot to allow for a pre-existing driveway. The new structure will be 32 feet wide and will have a height of approximately 22'3" above the foundation line. Staff notes that the foundation height is unnecessarily tall, and asks that the foundation be a maximum of 2' in height at the front of the house. With the reduction of the foundation height, the height of the structure meets the design guidelines. Staff finds the porch columns to be unusually tall and therefore out of scale with the historic context. Staff recommends that the column bases end at the porch floor level instead of continuing down to grade. On the right elevation, staff asks that the window openings toward the front of the house be enlarged so that they are a more typical window size. With the enlargement of the window on the right elevation, staff finds that the infill's proportion and rhythm of openings meet the design guidelines. The materials for the infill have all been approved by the Commission in the past, and included cement fiberboard lap siding, cedar shake, Miratec trim, concrete slab foundation with a parge coat, and asphalt shingle roof. Staff asks to approve all final material choices.

In conclusion, staff recommends approval with the conditions that:

1. A central walkway be included
2. The foundation be no more than 2' tall at the front
3. The front porch column bases end at the level of the front porch.
4. Staff approve all windows and doors and a brick or stone sample
5. The window openings on the east façade, towards the front of the house, be enlarged so they are the size of the windows in the gable field.

Mr. Bob Potter, owner of the property, explained that he preferred to eliminate the right-front window rather than enlarge it as recommended, as it will be as issue for furniture placement.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Commissioner Kaalberg stated that furniture placement was not a reason not to follow the design guideline's requirement of ordinary windows, as recommended in the staff recommendation.

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Kaalberg moved to approve with the conditions that a central walkway be included; the foundation be no more than 2' tall at the front; the front porch column bases end at the level of the front porch; staff approve all windows and doors and a brick or stone sample; and the window openings on the east façade, towards the front of the house, be enlarged so they are the size of the windows in the gable field. Commissioner Bell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

**s. 919 PETWAY AVE**

Application: New construction-infill

Council District: 05

Overlay: Greenwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER

Permit ID #: 1948477

Staff member, Sean Alexander, presented the case for 919 Petway Avenue.

919 Petway Avenue is very similar to the last application, two doors down to the west. Again it is to demolish a non-contributing building and construct a new house. The new house will be one and one-half stories tall with a side gabled bungalow form. The roof will be 28' tall from grade, and the eaves will be approximately 12' high. The house will be 32' wide. These proportions are very similar to those of comparable historic houses nearby.

Generally the design and materials are appropriate, but staff recommends that the window proportions on the upperstory not be taller than those of the first story, and that the rhythm of window placement be more in keeping with that of historic houses.

Also, staff finds the porch columns to be atypical in that they extend beyond the porch floor to meet grade.

There will be a gabled front dormer, with the front walls stacking over the primary first story wall. Staff recommends that the dormer be pushed back so as to be more compatible with historic forms.

On bungalow forms, when a porch is recessed under the primary roof of the house it is common for dormers to sit with its front wall out over the porch. When the front porch projects with a distinct roof of its own, dormers are set back from the primary wall.

In effect, dormers are always set back from the leading edge of the primary roof.

Staff recommends approval of the application with the following conditions:

- The front porch column bases not extend below the floor level of the front porch;
- Staff approve all windows and doors and the brick or sample prior to purchase and installation;
- The upperstory windows are no taller than those on the first story;
- A walkway be included from the porch to the public sidewalk, and that HVAC mechanicals are on the rear or side beyond the midpoint.

With these conditions, staff finds that the application meets Section II.B.1. of the *Greenwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay: Handbook and Design*

Mr. Potter, owner of the property, explained that he can correct the porch issue as he is going to work with a slab which will also bring the height down but he needs the dormer to be flush with the front wall as he is trying to keep space on the second level without increasing the footprint and dormer placement is inconsistent throughout the neighborhood.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Staff member, Mr. Alexander corrected the staff recommendation by explaining that the analysis for the appropriate dormer location was within the analysis but not repeated in the conditions as it should have been.

The Commission and staff discussed the appropriate location for the dormer and examples found within in the neighborhood. One option discussed might be for the porch roof to be the same plane as the existing house in order to retain the proposed dormer location since that would be consistent with a nearby historic building.

Mr. Potter stated they could change the roof pitch so that the porch roof and house were all one plane but the proposed roof form fits into the neighborhood better. He explained that he could provide multiple examples of other homes with dormers that are stacked on the front wall.

Vice-chairperson Nielson explained that they needed to be careful about setting a precedent and being consistent in their decisions.

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Nielson moved to approve the project with staff conditions including that the dormer be set back 2' or the line of the porch roof be changed so that the dormer can line up with the front of the house; the front porch column bases not extend below the floor level of the front porch; staff approve all windows and doors and the brick or sample prior to purchase and installation; the upperstory windows are no taller than those on the first story; a walkway be included from the porch to the public sidewalk; and that HVAC mechanicals are on the rear or side beyond the midpoint. Commissioner Champion seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

Meeting adjourned at 4:58.